



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,630	12/14/2001	William R. Matz	36968/265389	9447
23552	7590	01/21/2004	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/017,630

Applicant(s)

MATZ ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan Ouellette

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Request for Continued Examination***

1. The Request filed on 11/26/2003 for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 10/017,630 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Claim 18 has been cancelled; therefore, Claims 1-17, 19 and 20 remain pending in application 10/017630.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  4. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler (US 5,758,259) in view of Klarfeld et al. (US 2003/0067554 A1).
6. As per independent Claims 1, 12, and 16, Lawler discloses a method for providing a tailored media content comprising: analyzing a subscriber attribute in a subscriber database, wherein said subscriber database comprises a media-content-access history of

said subscriber (Abstract). (Abstract, Figs.3B-6, C1 L60-67, C2 L1-49, C5 L52-65, C7 L36-43, C9 L36-62, Claims 12-15).

7. Lawler fails to expressly disclose identifying unfulfilled subscriber demand based on said subscriber attribute; and in response to determining that an existing media-content offering does not meet subscriber demand, developing a new media-content offering from previously unavailable media-content based on said subscriber attribute.
8. However, Official notice is given that data-mining applications/techniques were well known at the time the invention was made, and identifying unfulfilled subscriber demand would be a simple matter of mining the viewer history data collected in the system disclosed by Lawler.
9. Furthermore, Klarfeld discloses developing targeted content (movies, shows) based on television user viewing histories (Abstract, Para 0261).
10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included identifying unfulfilled subscriber demand based on said subscriber attribute; and in response to determining that an existing media-content offering does not meet subscriber demand, developing a new media-content offering from previously unavailable media-content based on said subscriber attribute, as disclosed by Klarfeld in the system disclosed by Lawler, for the advantage of providing a method for providing a tailored media content, with the ability to increase customer satisfaction by continually improving and updating offered media content based on user requirements.
11. As per Claim 3, Lawler and *Klarfeld* disclose wherein said media-content-access history comprises a demographic measure (Fig. 23b) and wherein the method further comprises;

pricing said new media-content offering; and delivering said new media-content offering to said subscriber (See rejection of Claims 8-10, 13, and 14).

12. As per Claim 5, *Lawler* and Klarfeld disclose wherein said step of identifying unfulfilled subscriber demand comprises analyzing an existing media-content offering
13. As per Claims 8-10, 13, and 14, *Lawler* and Klarfeld fail to expressly disclose the steps of setting a price for said new media-content offering based on a cost to develop said new media-content offering, developing a direct marketing campaign complementary to said existing media-content offering whereby subscribers are directed to the existing offering, and developing an incentive plan complementary to at least one of said existing media-content offering and said new media-content offering.
14. However, these steps are obvious business strategies/techniques commonly used at the time the invention was made.
15. Furthermore, these steps can be accomplished completely through the use of the common business training/knowledge and require no additional apparatus described in the specification, which would have made the steps non-obvious to combine with the method described by *Lawler*, in order to create a method for providing a tailored media content, with the advantage of attracting customers using common business strategies/techniques.
16. As per Claims 11 and 15, *Lawler* and Klarfeld disclose creating a marketing bundle, wherein said marketing bundle comprises at least one of said existing media-content offering a product and said new media-content offering of a product and wherein the marketing bundle is created based on at least one of the following indirect methods of determining at least one of popularity of programming and effectiveness of advertising:

focus group tests; post-advertising surveys; and measures of product purchases (See Rejection of Claims 8-10, 13, and 14).

**17. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Lawler in view of Klarfeld.**

18. As per Claims 2 and 17, neither Lawler nor Klarfeld expressly show wherein said attribute further comprises a purchase history of said subscriber.

19. However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The method for providing a tailored media content would be performed regardless of the type of attribute used. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the purchase history of said subscriber as an attribute in the method for providing a tailored media content, because such an attribute does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the attribute does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

21. As per Claims 4 and 19, neither Lawler nor Klarfeld expressly show wherein said media-content-access history comprises a subscriber content-choice database.

22. However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The method for providing a tailored media content would be performed regardless of the type of media-content-access history

used. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a subscriber content-choice database as a media-content-access history in the method for providing a tailored media content, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the media-content-access history does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

24. As per Claims 6, 7, and 20, neither Lawler nor Klarfeld expressly show wherein said step of delivering said new media-content offering comprises delivering a previously unavailable television program or delivering a previously unavailable television-programming package.

25. However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The method for providing a tailored media content would be performed regardless of the type of media-content offering used. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

26. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a previously unavailable television program or a previously unavailable television-programming package as the media-content offering in

the method for providing a tailored media content, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the media-content offering does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17, 19, and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


### ***Conclusion***

28. Additional Non-Patent Literature has been referenced on the PTO-892 form attached to the previous office action, and the Examiner suggests the applicant review these documents before submitting any amendments.
29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Ouellette whose telephone number is (703) 605-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am - 5:00pm.
30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-3597 for After Final communications.




Art Unit: 3629

31. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.



jo  
January 6, 2004



JOHN G. WEISS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600